1: Lowie E-5 (1926) 1939 NT20 Washo NT20

II. SOCIAL LIFE

Government—Property

Settlements were minute: Jack recalled none with as many as ten huts; usually there were from two to four. As a child he lived with his parents and maternal grandparents; the neighbors, about thirty feet away, were not kin.

Though Bill spoke of Captain Jim as chief (tɛ.upe"yu) of all the Washo, this was probably a recent development. Bill could not say whether Jim had inherited the office from his father. When the "captain" went to Washington, D.C., he took with him as assistant Dick Bender, who had been to the Indian School in Carson and spoke fair English. It is not clear that Jim and Dick were related, but both were p'alaa"ei (see below).

The chief had nothing to do with fighting enemies or adjusting quarrels within the tribe; his sole function was to arrange dances and other gatherings, where he would exhort the Washo to be good (Dave, Bill). Jack's notion of a typical speech follows:[1]

Behave well, do not fight, play! If you lose, do not get angry. Play ball; some win, others lose. Play the basket game. Shoot rabbits, eat them. Make soup and eat it. After a while, shoot deer. Shoot grouse, sage hen, mountain quail, ground hogs, ground squirrels, meadow squirrels, small squirrels, mice. Go and hunt antelope and mountain sheep. Spear fish!

Daisy Bender and Big Susie gave this version of one of Captain Jim's speeches:[2]

Dance! Interlocking your fingers, dance! Husbands, interlock fingers, now with interlocking fingers dance! Dance! Then dance with your wives. Behave properly! Don't fight. Dance with your wives, make your wives sleep well.

Special headmen led in hunting jack rabbits, deer, and antelope, respectively. The antelope headman dreamed the right to office; the two others were purely secular leaders, the rabbit chief, according to Dave, being chosen by the people.

Property rights were maintained for clumps of pine-nut trees, patches being marked off by lines of rocks. Bill's patch was west of Double Spring, he and his brother, Charlie Buell, having inherited from their father. Bill's mother claimed clumps west of Mountain House, some falling to my informant's share. Sally, his sister, might properly have claimed part, but did not do so. Brothers never quarreled over pine-nut privileges; and if they had plenty, they would allow a married sister to pick from their tract. On the other hand, trespass by a stranger was resented, the owner rebuking him with such words as, "Don't pick pine nuts here! They are not yours, but mine." This might even lead to fighting. Mrs. Hardy, the postmistress of Coleville (in 1926), told me that the Indians meticulously respected one another's claims. Dave's father and paternal uncle owned four patches, of which Dave inherited one. A thief's pole was sometimes broken up by the rightful owner of a patch.

[1] Recorded in Washo. [2] Recorded in Washo.

344 177 [668] was performed (Dangberg n.d.). This eight sided structure and the nine sided "round house" built around 1940 by Ben Lancaster for meetings of the Native American Church near Coleville, California were innovations and not part of traditional Washo architecture.

Property and Inheritance

423 Washo groups had no communal property beyond the land they lived on and its resources. Some joint ownership of property occurred however. The kin group's common rights in specific pinenut picking grounds (dimasha) and eagle nests (patalmi m¢gi) are a form of joint property. Steward (1938, 256) described family ownership of pinenut groves among the Owens Valley Paiute, a rarity within the Great Basin.

The Washo thought of themselves as co-users of the territory along with the plants, animals, and a host of supernaturals. The rights of these other users had to be respected. Individuals or households could establish semi-permanent exclusive rights over specific locations for use purposes. A fish blind constructed over a deep place along a stream established the right of the person or household that had constructed it to fish in that [425] area. When the fish blind was abandoned for the season anyone else could use it; but the person who made the fish blind had established a right to return to that spot the following year.

422 Food or manufactured goods could be used or exchanged, but not destroyed. [782] The exception to this was ceremonial disposal where there was a ritual requirement to destroy the goods (see p. 47). Also individuals who infringed upon others' traditional pinenut picking grounds may have their baskets and [685] other gathering equipment destroyed for them by the rightful owners of that picking ground.

A connection was believed to obtain between the objects and the persons who made them. In Washo society every manufactured object was personalized [768] in this way. The intimate connection between objects and persons is seen in the abandonment or destruction of the goods a deceased individual had [431] made, even if the goods had been given to someone else. In a sense, the maker always maintained partial ownership in any objects he produced.

621 423 Each Washo local group owned for use-purposes the hunting territory, fishing streams, and springs that it actually used. If the members of a cluster of cooperating households regularly hunted in a certain area, their right to exclusive hunting in that area emerged over time. Informants say that a person had a theoretical right to hunt anywhere, but in practice he hunted in a fairly limited area. This was in part due to the accessibility of the hunting area with regard to a group's habitual wintering grounds. It was also due to the intimate knowledge that a hunter gains of a limited section of the total hunting territory. But it also derived from the concept of local group prerogatives, and the necessity to receive permission when intruding upon recognized sub-territories.

Descent and Inheritance

Descent is basically bilateral. Because personal property is destroyed at death and houses are torn down and abandoned, they cannot be inherited. Plots of pinenut trees are privately owned and are inherited bilaterally. The plots are marked by lines of stones. If an individual is discovered gathering in the wrong plot, the owner may take the intruder's pinenuts and break the implements he used. A person has the right to pick in his spouse's plot, but this right terminates at the death of the spouse. Barrett (1917) writes that each village has a hereditary chief, teūbčýū (Barrett's transcription), and that the office passes from father to son. Lowie (1939), on the other hand, says that one of his informants reported a teūbčýū for all the Washo; but he comments that this is probably a recent development. His informants did not know whether the chief inherited from his father. Our informants, as well as Lowie's, mention chiefs (teūbčýū) who, in aboriginal times, would call people together on ceremonial occasions and address them, telling them to behave properly. These chiefs had no authority beyond their ceremonial functions; there is no evidence concerning the possible inheritance of the office. Special headmen led the communal rabbit, antelope and deer hunts. According to Barrett (1917), the rabbit chief inherits his office, but Lowie (1939) says he is chosen by the people. Two of our informants, Nancy Emm and Roy James, say the rabbit chief inherited from his father. The antelope chief is a shaman who dreams the right to his office. Shamans do not inherit their positions. Any able hunter is the leader of a communal deer hunt (Barrett, 1917, 9, 12; Lowie, 1939, 303). Inheritance among the modern Washo is bilateral. Family names may be inherited from either the father or mother. Some of the marriages contracted by the younger Washo are of very brief duration, and in this circumstance the child often takes the family name of the mother. The offspring of more permanent unions take the father's name.

611 428 423 [768] [685] 622 [643] [178] 624 224 [756] 611 428 424 55 581

Family, Moiety, and Local Group

The nuclear family was the basic unit of aboriginal Washo social organization. The Washo practiced polygyny and therefore had some polygynous families. Whether the polygynous families ever reached a frequency of 20%, a figure that Murdock (1949, 28) uses to distinguish between societies with polygynous families and those with monogamous families, cannot be determined because polygyny is now prohibited by law and the Washo no longer practice it. According to our informants, the aboriginal Washo family was nuclear; none of the published sources contains contrary evidence. The modern Washo family is nuclear, but it sometimes includes a few other relatives.

594 595